

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

DAVID HOPKINS PLEMONS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 3:18-cv-00498
)	
CORE CIVIC ADMINISTRATIVE)	
HEADQUARTERS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	


ORDER

Magistrate Judge Frensley has entered a Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 55) regarding Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, to which Plaintiff filed a 15-page document that he labels “Plaintiff’s Objection to the Report and Recommendation” (Doc. No. 66). No matter the title, the document is not a proper objection. Instead of filing “specific written objection to the proposed findings and recommendation” as required by Rule 72(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff filed what appears to be verbatim copies of headnotes from cases relating to such things as discovery, discovery sanctions, Section 1983, and the standards of review for motion for summary judgment. Interspersed therein, are random allegations of what Plaintiff apparently believes the proof will ultimately show. None of this suggests how Magistrate Judge Frensley supposedly erred.

Regardless, having reviewed the matter *de novo* pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court agrees with the Report and Recommendation. As Magistrate Judge Frensley correctly observed, Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (1) “is a rambling 36 page document that utterly fails to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(1) or Local Rule 56.01(b)”; (2) “has no supporting Memorandum of Law”; (3) “fails to cite to the record; and (4) contains no Statement of Undisputed Material Fact

as required by this Court's Local Rules. (Id. at 4). Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 55) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**; Plaintiff's Objection thereto (Doc. No. 66) is **OVERRULED**; and Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 47) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



WAVERLY DCRENSHAW, JR.
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE